

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4-10, 13-19, 22-28, and 31-38 are pending in the present application.

Claims 1, 10, 19, 28, 37, and 38 are amended by the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1, 6, 10, 15, 19, 24, 28, 33, 37, and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Toyoda (U.S. Patent No. 6,335,966); Claims 4, 5, 7, 13, 14, 16, 22, 23, 25, 31, 32, and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Toyoda in view of Kakimoto (U.S. Patent No. 6,775,688); Claims 8, 17, 26, and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Toyoda, Kakimoto, and Merritt et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,421,429, herein “Merritt”); and Claims 9, 18, 27, and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Toyoda in view of Bowker et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0039615, herein “Bowker”).

In view of the outstanding grounds of rejections, independent Claims 1, 10, 19, 28, 37, and 38 are amended to more clearly recite that an accommodating capability verifying unit is configured to verify an information accommodating capability in at least a reception terminal or in a communication system encompassing the reception terminal based only on a domain of an E-mail address. The claim amendments find support in the specification, for example at page 15, first full paragraph. No new matter is believed to be added.

Briefly recapitulating, independent Claim 1 is directed to an information processing apparatus that transmits an E-mail information to a reception terminal. The apparatus includes, *inter alia*, an accommodating capability verifying unit that verifies an information accommodating capability in at least a reception terminal or in a communication system encompassing the reception terminal based only on a domain of an E-mail address used in sending the E-mail information to the at least a reception terminal.

Turning to the applied art, Toyoda discloses an internet facsimile apparatus that is capable of retrieving information about a reception terminal. Toyoda shows in Figure 1 that an IFAX machine 11A is capable to communicate with a server 13A via a LAN connection to retrieve information about the receiving terminal from a capability exchange table 50 (see Figures 4 and 5) stored on the server 13A, as disclosed at column 6, lines 43-54.

In addition, Toyoda shows in Figure 4 that a destination information table includes, among other information, a telephone number of a receiving fax machine and the mail address of that fax machine. Further, Toyoda shows in Figure 5 that for each receiving fax machine, various capability items are provided and stored in the capability exchange table 50. In other words, the IFAX machine 11A, before sending a fax to a fax machine 11B, retrieves information about the fax machine 11B from the server 13A.

However, Toyoda does not teach or suggest that the capability items shown in Figure 5 are obtained by the IFAX machine 11A **based only** on the mail address of the fax machine 11B. In fact, as shown in Figure 5, Toyoda retrieves the information about the fax machine 11B based on a combination of (1) the telephone number, (2) the mail address, and (3) the type of the fax machine 11B.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Toyoda does not teach or suggest an accommodating capability verifying unit that verifies an information accommodating capability in at least a reception terminal or in a communication system encompassing the reception terminal based only on a domain from an E-mail address, as required by amended Claims 1, 10, 19, 28, 37, and 38.

The remaining applied art has been considered but none cures the deficiencies of Toyoda discussed above.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 1, 10, 19, 28, 37, and 38 and each of the claims depending therefrom patentably distinguish over the applied art.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

Remus F. Fetea, Ph.D.
Registration No. 59,140

BDL:RFF\dt
I:\ATTY\RFF\27s\275754US\275754US-AM.DOC

Scott A. McKeown
Registration No. 42,866